

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-29, 34, 36-48 are pending in the Application, of which claims 1, 24, 25, 26, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 47 are independent. No new matter was added. Applicants urge that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the reasons set forth below.

I. Summary of Rejections

In the Office Action:

claims 1, 3-5, 9-13, 18-19, 23 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,877,138 to Fitzpatrick et al. (hereafter “Fitzpatrick”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,753 to Budinsky et al. (hereafter “Budinsky”);

claims 7 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,070,006 to Iriuchijima (hereafter “Iriuchijima”);

claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,092 to Dhond (hereafter “Dhond”);

claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,949 to Shudo et al. (hereafter “Shudo”);

claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,964 to Zink et al. (hereafter “Zink”) and in further view of Budinsky;

claims 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,386,568 to Wold et al. (hereafter “Wold”) and in further view of Budinsky;

claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132964 by Santori (hereafter “Santori”);

claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132964 by Singh (hereafter “Singh”); and

claims 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069400 by Miloushev et al. (hereafter “Miloushev”) in view of Budinsky.

These rejections are discussed below.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-13, 18-19, 23 and 30-31

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 9-13, 18-19, 23 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions, the medium comprising:
 - instructions for *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram*;
 - instructions for *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*;
 - instructions for receiving a designation of at least one destination block in said block diagram; and
 - instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination block.

Regarding claim 1, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest at least *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks* and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claim 1.

Regarding ***determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks***, in the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Fitzpatrick does not disclose or suggest this feature of the Applicants' claims (Office Action, p. 3, § 8). Applicants respectfully agree. The Examiner relies upon Budinsky to cure this deficiency in Fitzpatrick. Specifically, the Examiner claims that Budinsky discloses determining of an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks at column 1, lines 58-67 in Budinsky (Office Action, p. 3, § 8). Applicants respectfully disagree.

At column 1, lines 58-67, Budinsky describes examining definitions of entities (e.g., objects, messages or data) to be integrated and determining which of their elements match (Budinsky, Col. 1, lines 58-67). However, Budinsky provides no indication that the elements include characteristics of blocks in a block diagram. Moreover, the matching process described by Budinsky involves identifying matching elements on the basis of criteria (Budinsky, Col. 1, lines 28-39). However, Budinsky provides no disclosure or suggestion that this criteria includes finding an intersection of characteristics associated with blocks in a block diagram.

Regarding ***selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics***, in the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Fitzpatrick discloses this feature of the Applicants' claims at Col. 2, lines 19-21 (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Fitzpatrick does not disclose or suggest selecting characteristics associated with blocks in a block diagram. Second, as noted above, the Examiner has admitted that Fitzpatrick does not disclose determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks. Since Fitzpatrick does not disclose or suggest determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks, Fitzpatrick cannot disclose or suggest ***selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics***, which is present in claim 1. The Examiner has made no showing that Budinsky discloses or suggests ***selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics***.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 30-31 have been canceled so the above rejection of claims 5 and 30-31 is moot. Claims 3, 4, 9-13, 18-19 and 23 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 9-13, 18-19 and 23 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 3, 4, 9-13, 18-19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 7 and 21

In the Office Action, claims 7 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of Iriuchijima. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 7 and 21 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. As discussed above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky do not disclose or suggest ***determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram, and selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics***, which are present in claims 7 and 21. In addition, Iriuchijima fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Iriuchijima, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest ***determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram, and selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics***, which are present in claims 7 and 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 7 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

C. Claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22

In the Office Action, claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of Dhond. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. As noted above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any

reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram*, and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22. Dhond fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Dhond, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram*, and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

D. Claims 14 and 15

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of Shudo. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. As discussed above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram*, and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claims 14 and 15. Shudo fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

Applicants respectively urge that Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Shudo, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram*, and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claims 14 and 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

E. Claims 40 and 41

In the Office Action, claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Zink and in further view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 41 depends from claim 40 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 40. Claim 40 recites ***determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source lines and selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*** which, as noted above, are not disclosed or suggested by either Fitzpatrick and Budinsky. Zink fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Zink, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest ***determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source lines and selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics***, which are present in claims 40 and 41. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

F. Claims 42-44

In the Office Action, claims 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 43-44 depend from claim 42 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 42. As noted above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest ***determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram and selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics***, which are present in claim 42. Wold fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Wold, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest ***determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram and selecting at***

least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics, which are present in claims 42-44.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

G. Claim 45

In the Office Action, claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of Santori. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 45 depends from claim 42 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 42. As noted above, Wold and Fitzpatrick, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram* and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claim 45. Santori fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick, Wold and Santori, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram* and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claim 45. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

H. Claim 46

In the Office Action, claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of Singh. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 46 depends from claim 42 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 42. As noted above, Wold and Fitzpatrick, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common*

to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claim 42. Likewise, Singh does not disclose or suggest these claim features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick, Wold and Singh, taken either taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram* and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

I. Claims 47 and 48

In the Office Action, claims 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloushev in view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 48 depends from claim 47 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 47. As noted above, Budinsky does not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a first source block and a second source block in a block diagram* and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claims 47 and 48. Miloushev fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

As noted above, Budinsky does not disclose or suggest *determining an intersection of characteristics common to a first source block and a second source block in a block diagram* and *selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics*, which are present in claims 47 and 48. Miloushev fails to disclose or suggest at least these claim features.

For the reasons set forth above, Miloushev and Budsinky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 47-48. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 47-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-033. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: January 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Neslihan I. Doran/
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: L0389
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant